arXiv:1606.03967v3 [quant-ph] 27 Dec 2016

Unscrambling the Quantum Omelette of Epistemic and Ontic Contextuality (Part I): Preexistent Properties or Measurement Outcomes?

Christian de Ronde*

CONICET, Buenos Aires University - Argentina
Center Leo Apostel and Foundations of the Exact Sciences
Brussels Free University - Belgium

Abstract

In this paper we attempt to analyze the physical and philosophical meaning of quantum contextuality. We will argue that there exists a general confusion within the foundational literature arising from the improper "scrambling" of two different meanings of *quantum contextuality*. While the first one, introduced by Bohr, is related to an *epistemic* interpretation of contextuality which stresses the incompatibility (or complementarity) of certain measurement situations described in classical terms; the second meaning of contextuality is related to an *ontic* notion of contextuality and is best exposed by the Kochen-Specker theorem, which focuses on the constraints of the orthodox quantum formalism to interpret projection operators as preexistent or actual (definite valued) properties. We will show how these two notions have been scrambled together creating an "omelette of contextuality" which has been fully widespread through a popularized "epistemic explanation" of the KS theorem according to which: *The measurement outcome of the observable A when measured together with B or together with C will necessarily differ in case* $[A, B] = [A, C] = 0$*, and* $[B, C] \neq 0$. We will show why this statement is not only improperly scrambling epistemic and ontic perspectives, but is also physically and philosophically meaningless. To conclude we discuss how this omelette has provided the soil of several misunderstandings and confusions within the foundational literature.

Keywords: quantum contextuality, epistemic view, ontic view, physical reality.

*Fellow Researcher of the Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas. Philosophy Institute "Dr. A. Korn", Buenos Aires University. Adjoint Profesor of the National University Arturo Jauretche. E-mail: cderonde@vub.ac.be

Introduction

Quantum contextuality is not only important for the philosophical understanding of Quantum Mechanics (QM), but is also key to the present technological developments of quantum information processing. This paper attempts to shed some light on the physical and philosophical meaning of quantum contextuality by discussing three main statements:

1. There are two different notions of contextuality in QM confused within the foundational literature. On the one hand, an epistemic notion which discusses about measurement processes and outcomes, and on the other, an ontic notion of contextuality which discusses about preexistent properties independent of observations.

2. KS theorem provides constraints to interpret projection operators as preexistent properties and makes no reference whatsoever to measurement outcomes.

3. Peres' widespread epistemic explanation has created the illusion it is possible to relate KS theorem to measurement outcomes and provide an epistemic interpretation of it.

The first statement makes explicit the difference between two different notions of contextuality many times scrambled improperly within the foundation literature. The second statement relates to what we consider to be the proper understanding of the KS theorem and the third one relates to what has become a common misunderstanding. As we shall argue, a consequence of the third statement is the illusion that KS theorem can be directly related to measurable statistical inequalities; something that has been proposed during the last decades [12, 30, 38]. We will discuss why such a derivation weakens the conclusive power of KS theorem. In this respect, our analysis goes in line with David Mermin's intuition according to which "the whole notion of an experimental test of KS [theorem] misses the point".[1]

Our paper shows the deep importance of philosophical considerations for the proper elucidation of foundational debates about QM. It is organized as follows. In the first section we discuss the main differences between epistemic and ontic views within the debate about the meaning of quantum theory. In section 2 we address the omelette that has been created within the foundational literature regarding objective and subjective perspectives, ontological and epistemlogical, etc. Section 3 presents an epistemic notion of contextuality grounded on Bohr's analysis of (classical) complementary or incompatible measurement situations. In section 4 we provide an ontic definition of contextuality grounded on KS theorem which makes reference to preexistent properties. In section 5 we criticize Peres' epistemic interpretation of KS theorem in terms of measurement outcomes. Finally, in section 6, we analyze the consequences of such widespread epistemic reading of KS theorem as related to statistical statements of measurement outcomes. We end our paper with a short conclusion.

1 Epistemic vs Ontic Views in QM

The epistemic and ontic views have played a significant role in the debate about the meaning and interpretation of QM. In particular, as we shall argue, these two distinct philosophical perspectives have also played a fundamental role in the misunderstanding of one of the main characteristics of the theory of quanta, known in the literature as quantum contextuality. In order to address this notion we shall begin our paper by a short review of the role played by both epistemic and ontic viewpoints within the theory of quanta. Our intention is not to provide an historic account of contextuality nor to discuss the "true interpretation" of Bhorian philosophy

[1] Mermin as cited by A. Cabello in [12].

of physics, but rather to situate quantum contextuality within the more general debate about the philosophical meaning of QM. We should also stress that even though the definitions of what is to be considered an 'epistemic view' and what is 'ontic view' are obviously debatable, there are some general characteristics which we will attempt to differentiate. Our main interest is to distinguish between two very different approaches regarding the understanding of QM.

According to Marchildon [32] "In the epistemic view, the state vector (or wave function, or density matrix) does not represent the objective state of a microscopic system (like an atom, an electron, a photon), but rather our knowledge of the probabilities of outcomes of macroscopic measurements." This perspective is not new in QM. It might be traced back to Niels Bohr's interpretation of the theory as a rational generalization of classical mechanics [10]. Indeed, the approach of the Danish physicist might be regarded as one of the first attempts to understand QM in epistemological —rather than ontological terms— terms. Indeed, the Bohr stressed repeatedly that what we should learn from QM is an "epistemological lesson"; namely, that we are not only spectators, but also actors in the great drama of existence. This idea goes in line with his understanding of physics itself according to which [8]: "Physics is to be regarded not so much as the study of something a priori given, but rather as the development of methods of ordering and surveying human experience. In this respect our task must be to account for such experience in a manner independent of individual subjective judgement and therefor objective in the sense that it can be unambiguously communicated in ordinary human language." The epistemic interpretation of QM was developed in many different directions and has become a standard way of understanding the theory, one which does not get involved in the problems discussed by realists. Indeed, as Marchildon remarks [*Op. cit.*], it is argued by its followers that the epistemic viewpoint "considerably clarifies, or even completely dissolves, the EPR paradox and the measurement problem." In the present, the epistemic view has been taken to its most radical limit by an approach put forward by Christopher Fuchs, Asher Peres, Rüdiger Schack and David Mermin, known as "Quantum Bayesianism", or in short: QBism. This might be regarded as one of the most radical epistemic approaches and becomes a good example of what this perspective amounts to. Let us discuss it in some detail.

QBism argues explicitly against an ontological reading of QM and assumes a subjectivist perspective taking as a standpoint the epistemic Bayesian understanding of probability [21]. The origin of QBism might be traced back to a paper published in the year 2000 entitled *Quantum Theory Needs no 'Interpretation'*. In that paper, Fuchs and Asher Peres [20, p. 70] argued that: "[...] quantum theory does not describe physical reality. What it does is provide an algorithm for computing probabilities for the macroscopic events ('detector clicks') that are the consequences of experimental interventions. This strict definition of the scope of quantum theory is the only interpretation ever needed, whether by experimenters or theorists." Even though the epistemic view has many different proponents, we regard QBism as the most consistent, clear and honest epistemic account of QM (see for a detailed analysis [15]). As remarked by Fuchs, Mermin and Shack [21, p. 2]: "QBism explicitly takes the 'subjective' or 'judgmental' or 'personalist' view of probability, which, though common among contemporary statisticians and economists, is still rare among physicists: probabilities are assigned to an event by an agent and are particular to that agent. The agent's probability assignments express her own personal degrees of belief about the event." According to them: "A measurement in QBism is more than a procedure in a laboratory. It is any action an agent takes to elicit a set of possible experiences. The measurement outcome is the particular experience of that agent elicited in this way. Given a measurement outcome, the quantum formalism guides the agent in updating her probabilities for subsequent measurements." QBists are crystal clear: "A measurement does not, as the term unfortunately suggests, reveal a pre-existing state of affairs." Measurements are "personal" and QM is a "tool" for the "user" —as Mermin prefers to call the "agent" [33].

The focus of the epistemic viewpoint which discusses almost exclusively in terms of measurement processes and outcomes is clearly confronted by the ontic viewpoint which insists on interpreting QM beyond measurement outcomes. The ontic view, in the context of QM, can be obviously related to Albert Einstein's philosophical position which confronted Bohr's epistemic understanding of physics. According to this view, it is the physical representation provided by a theory that which expresses what reality is about independently of human choices and conscious beings. As remarked by Einstein [16, p. 175]: "[...] it is the purpose of theoretical physics to achieve understanding of physical reality which exists independently of the observer, and for which the distinction between 'direct observable' and 'not directly observable' has no ontological significance." Unlike positivism, Einstein did not accept observables as "self evident" *givens*.[2] For Einstein, the interrelation between the description of physical reality and metaphysics was a central elements of physics itself (see [24]). He also stressed, like Heisenberg, the importance of developing new physical concepts in order to adequately address new fields of phenomena. Contrary to the epistemic viewer, it is only the formalism of a theory adequately related to physical concepts which is capable of describing phenomena. As Einstein remarked to a young Heisenberg [23, p. 63]: "It is only the theory which decides what we can observe."

To summarize, as characterized the epistemic and the ontic viewpoints face very different problems and concerns. While the epistemic view concentrates in the way subjects (also called 'agents', 'users', etc.) are capable of relating to observable measurement outcomes, the ontic perspective focuses on the physical meaning and interpretation of the formalism of the theory. In this case, observability —as Einstein himself stressed repeatedly— has no ontological significance; it is only regarded as part of a verification procedure about the empirical adequacy (or not) of the theory in question. While the epistemic proponent might understand the theory as a mere "algorithm" or "economy" of experience, for the ontic viewer a theory and its formalism are telling us something about reality itself. While the former takes the observability of subjects to be the starting point of science and also the end, the latter fundaments the theory in relation to the objective —i.e., subject independent— representation of physical reality. Unfortunately, within QM, these two radically opposite viewpoints —in what respects the presuppositions involved in the meaning of a theory— have been mixed in a "omelette" that we need to unscramble.

2 The Quantum Omelette

The philosophical stance that we assume defines the specific problems, the possible questions and (even) answers that fall within our system of thought. But a limit is also a possibility, an horizon. A particular perspective limits the possibility of questioning but it also constitutes it. Problems are not "out there" independent of philosophical perspectives, they are part of a definite viewpoints with particular metaphysical assumptions, presuppositions, without which problems could not be even stated. For example, a reductionistic perspective compared to a pluralist one will radically differ when considering the quantum to classical limit [14]. And while a realist considers as necessary the existence of an objective representation which explains what the formalism is talking about, the instrumentalist might remain content with an intersubjective epistemic account of measurement outcomes operationally provided *via* a mathematical formalism understood merely as an algorithm. Unfortunately, within the philosophy of QM, we are at

[2]This can be seen from the very interesting discussion between Heisenberg and Einstein [23, p. 66] were the latter explains: "I have no wish to appear as an advocate of a naive form of realism; I know that these are very difficult questions, but then I consider Mach's concept of observation also much too naive. He pretends that we know perfectly well what the word 'observe' means, and thinks this exempts him from having to discriminate between 'objective' and 'subjective' phenomena."

a stage where ontology and epistemology, objectivity and subjectivity have been mixed up in an "omelette" that we need to unscramble. As Jaynes makes the point:

> "[O]ur present [quantum mechanical] formalism is not purely epistemological; it is a peculiar mixture describing in part realities of Nature, in part incomplete human information about Nature —all scrambled up by Heisenberg and Bohr into an omelette that nobody has seen how to unscramble. Yet we think that the unscrambling is a prerequisite for any further advance in basic physical theory. For, if we cannot separate the subjective and objective aspects of the formalism, we cannot know what we are talking about; it is just that simple." [27, p. 381]

It is interesting to notice, however, that one of the first scramblings of objective and subjective elements was produced, neither from Bohr nor Heisenberg, but by one of the strongest attacks the theory of quanta. In the famous EPR paper [19], the definition of what had to be considered an *element of physical reality* —in the context of QM— begun the explicit scrambling between an objective *ontic* definition of reality and the subjective, *epistemic* reference, to the quantum measurement process. According to the famous definition: *If, without in any way disturbing a system, we can predict with certainty (i.e., with probability equal to unity) the value of a physical quantity, then there exists an element of reality corresponding to that quantity.* As it is known in the foundational literature, the problem comes with the phrase: "without in any way disturbing the system".[3] Bohr himself stressed this fact, in his also famous reply [7, p. 697], arguing that the "criterion of physical reality [...] contains —however cautions its formulation may appear— an essential ambiguity when it is applied to the actual problems with which we are here concerned." Bohr used this "ambiguity" to reintroduce the epistemic analysis of measurements considering "in some detail a few simple examples of measuring arrangements" [*Op. cit*, p. 697].

Einstein knew very well that a realist should not define physical reality in epistemic terms for that would involve the improper intromission of a subject, breaking down the very possibility to consider an 'objective reality' detached from subjective choices (we will come back to this important point in section 7). But Einstein was not responsible for this definition. It was his student Podolsky who had accepted the intromission of measurement within the definition of an 'element of reality' in order to expose the incompleteness of QM. But Bohr was too smart to accept the deal. In his brilliant reply, he deconstructed EPR's whole argumentation by concentrating on the measurement process alone. Bohr was not willing to enter the ontological debate proposed by Einstein (see for a detailed discussion [3]). As remarked by his assistant Aage Petersen:

> "Traditional philosophy has accustomed us to regard language as something secondary and reality as something primary. Bohr considered this attitude toward the relation between language and reality inappropriate. When one said to him that it cannot be language which is fundamental, but that it must be reality which, so to speak, lies beneath language, and of which language is a picture, he would reply, "We are suspended in language in such a way that we cannot say what is up and what is down. The word 'reality' is also a word, a word which we must learn to use correctly" Bohr was not puzzled by ontological problems or by questions as to how concepts are related to reality. Such questions seemed sterile to him. He saw the problem of knowledge in a different light." [37, p. 11]

Indeed, Bohr was very careful not to enter ontic debates and always remained within the limits of his epistemic analysis. But Heisenberg was not so careful. He wanted, on the one hand, to support Bohr's epistemological approach, and on the other, his own Platonist ontological

[3] See in this respect the famous paper by John Bell: *Against 'Measurement'* [5].

scheme. In his book, *Physics and Philosophy* [22], Heisenberg begun to create what is known today as "The Copenhagen Interpretation of QM" (see for discussion [25]). This interpretation attempted to bring together not only Bohr's epistemological approach and the necessity of classical language but also Heisenberg's own Platonist realism about mathematical equations in physical theories [23, p. 91]. While Bohr's anti-metaphysical commitment considered the language of Newton and Maxwell as the fundament of all possible physical phenomena, Heisenberg's closed theory approach insisted in the radical incommensurability of the physical concepts used by different theories [9]. This book shows not only Heisenberg's fantastic historical and philosophical knowledge about physics, but also the omelette he created scrambling improperly objective and subjective elements, ontology and epistemology. A good example of the quantum omelette cooked in Heisenberg's book is the following passage:

> "With regard to this situation Bohr has emphasized that it is more realistic to state that the division into the object and the rest of the world is not arbitrary. Our actual situation in research work in atomic physics is usually this: we wish to understand a certain phenomenon, we wish to recognize how this phenomenon follows from the general laws of nature. Therefore, that part of matter or radiation which takes part in the phenomenon is the natural 'object' in the theoretical treatment and should be separated in this respect from the tools used to study the phenomenon. *This again emphasizes a subjective element in the description of atomic events, since the measuring device has been constructed by the observer, and we have to remember that what we observe is not nature in itself but nature exposed to our method of questioning.* Our scientific work in physics consists in asking questions about nature in the language that we possess and trying to get an answer from experiment by the means that are at our disposal. In this way quantum theory reminds us, as Bohr has put it, of the old wisdom that when searching for harmony in life one must never forget that in the drama of existence we are ourselves both players and spectators. It is understandable that in our scientific relation to nature our own activity becomes very important when we have to deal with parts of nature into which we can penetrate only by using the most elaborate tools." [22, p. 9] (emphasis added)

Th confusion comes from the fact that acknowledging physical representation and experience have been created through concepts and tools specifically designed by us, humans, is completely different from claiming that the choice of a specific experimental arrangement determines physical reality itself. This situation in QM, regarding the subjective definition of physical reality, was clearly recognized by Einstein who remained always uncomfortable with the epistemological reasoning of Bohr. As recalled by Pauli:

> "*Einstein*'s opposition to [quantum mechanics] is again reflected in his papers which he published, at first in collaboration with *Rosen* and *Podolsky*, and later alone, as a critique of the concept of reality in quantum mechanics. We often discussed these questions together, and I invariably profited very greatly even when I could not agree with *Einstein*'s view. 'Physics is after all the description of reality' he said to me, continuing, with a sarcastic glance in my direction 'or should I perhaps say physics is the description of what one merely imagines?' This question clearly shows *Einstein*'s concern that the objective character of physics might be lost through a theory of the type of quantum mechanics, in that as a consequence of a wider conception of the objectivity of an explanation of nature the difference between physical reality and dream or hallucination might become blurred." [35, p. 122]

Independently of Einstein's efforts to discuss the possible physical representation of quantum reality, the Bohrian approach has become a silent orthodoxy that limits the analysis of QM down

to the almost exclusive set of problems which —following Bohr's interpretation— presuppose the representation of reality that results from classical physics. In the following section we attempt to discuss the specific notion of contextuality which can be derived from Bohr's philosophical perspective.

3 Bohr's *Epistemic Contextuality*

Bohr's notion of contextuality is directly related to his analysis of the double-slit experiment and the necessary requirement to provide an account of each experimental set up in terms of classical concepts (i.e., the wave-particle duality).[4] The epistemic solution presented by Bohr was provided through his notion of complementarity which allowed him to consider mutually incompatible classical representations such as those of 'wave' and 'particle'.

Bohr's epistemic solution was tested by Einstein's attempt to reintroduce an ontic debate within the theory of quanta. As we mentioned above, in the EPR paper Einstein introduced his by now famous definition of what could be considered to be an *element of physical reality* within quantum theory. In this way he was attempting to force Bohr to enter the debate within his own realist terms. But, as already mentioned, Bohr would not accept the deal. Einstein had left a loose end in his definition, an "ambiguity" which allowed Bohr to go back into the safety of his epistemological analysis. He did so through his *epistemic* notion of contextuality based on the incompatibility of (complementary) measurement set ups. According to Bohr:

> "This necessity of discriminating in each experimental arrangement between those parts of the physical system considered which are to be treated as measuring instruments and those which constitute the objects under investigation may indeed be said to form a *principal distinction between classical and quantum-mechanical description of physical phenomena.*" [*Op. Cit.*, p. 701] (emphasis in the original)

As stressed by Bohr [*Op. Cit.*], this fundamental distinction "has its root in the indispensable use of classical concepts in the interpretation of all proper measurements, even though the classical theories do not suffice in accounting for the new types of regularities with which we are concerned in atomic physics." Bohr's contextuality implied the need to discuss in terms of 'classical contexts'; i.e. contexts described in terms of classical experimental apparatuses. This (metaphysical) requirement was secured, not by the quantum formalism but, by his insistence in the necessity of the use of the classical physical language. Bohr [39, p. 7] stated that: "[...] the unambiguous interpretation of any measurement must be essentially framed in terms of classical physical theories, and we may say that in this sense the language of Newton and Maxwell will remain the language of physicists for all time." In this respect, he argued "it would be a misconception to believe that the difficulties of the atomic theory may be evaded by eventually replacing the concepts of classical physics by new conceptual forms." This metaphysical precondition was in line with his neo-Kantian philosophical perspective according to which phenomena must be necessarily considered as classical space-time phenomena. Bohr never discussed in terms of the mathematical formalism of the theory, which he considered to be a "purely symbolic scheme". Instead, he took as a standpoint the representation of experimental set ups in terms of classical physics and its language.

We call the notion of contexuality addressed by Bohr "epistemic" because his analysis was grounded on the reference to measurement situations with classical apparatuses, in which classical phenomena could be addressed. Bohr assumed the perspective of a subject which describes

[4] See for a detailed analysis: [10].

experimental situations in terms of classical physics. In this sense, he was focused —as it can be clearly seen in his reply to EPR— in the process of measurement.

DEFINITION 3.1 **Bohr's Epistemic Contextuality:** *Contexts, which are considered in terms of experimental situations described in terms of classical physical concepts, are incompatible in QM. The most paradigmatic example of this notion of contextuality is the wave-particle duality present in the double-slit experiment.*

Regardless of the acceptance of such standpoint in the orthodox literature we would like to stress that this definition of *epistemic contextuality* is in itself a metaphysical presupposition which has no direct relation to the orthodox formalism of QM. The idea that "all experience must be described in classical terms" is not an "obvious" nor "self evident" statement. In fact, there is no constraint of the formalism regarding the possibility to understand and discuss quantum contextuality beyond classical concepts —a possibility which Bohr considered inadmisible. The development of a non-classical representation remains a logical possibility that should not be erased from the field of research without good reasons. As stressed by Einstein:

> "Concepts that have proven useful in ordering things easily achieve such an authority over us that we forget their earthly origins and accept them as unalterable givens. Thus they come to be stamped as 'necessities of thought,' 'a priori givens,' etc. The path of scientific advance is often made impossible for a long time through such errors. For that reason, it is by no means an idle game if we become practiced in analyzing the long common place concepts and exhibiting those circumstances upon which their justification and usefulness depend, how they have grown up, individually, out of the givens of experience. By this means, their all-too-great authority will be broken. They will be removed if they cannot be properly legitimated, corrected if their correlation with given things be far too superfluous, replaced by others if a new system can be established that we prefer for whatever reason." [26]

4 Kochen-Specker's *Ontic Contextuality*

Contrary to Bohr, Simon Kochen and Ernst Specker begun their analysis, taking as a standpoint the orthodox formalism of QM, asking an ontological question which has no epistemic reference whatsoever. *Would it be possible to consider projection operators as actual (definite valued) preexistent properties within the orthodox formalism of QM?* This question led them to a very interesting analysis which we now shortly recall.

In QM the frames under which a vector is represented mathematically are considered in terms of orthonormal bases. We say that a set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ an n-dimensional Hilbert space is an *orthonormal basis* if $\langle x_i | x_j \rangle = 0$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $\langle x_i | x_i \rangle = 1$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. A physical quantity is represented by a self-adjoint operator on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is a *context* if $\mathcal{A}$ is a commutative subalgebra generated by a set of self-adjoint bounded operators $\{A_1, \ldots, A_s\}$ of $\mathcal{H}$. Quantum contextuality, which was most explicitly recognized through the Kochen-Specker (KS) theorem [29], asserts that a value ascribed to a physical quantity A cannot be part of a global assignment of values but must, instead, depend on some specific context from which A is to be considered. Let us see this with some more detail.

Physically, a global valuation allows us to define the preexistence of definite properties. Mathematically, a *valuation* over an algebra $\mathcal{A}$ of self-adjoint operators on a Hilbert space, is a real function satisfying,

1. *Value-Rule (VR)*: For any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, the value $v(A)$ belongs to the spectrum of A, $v(A) \in \sigma(A)$.

2. *Functional Composition Principle (FUNC)*: For any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and any real-valued function f, i.e. $v(f(A)) = f(v(A))$.

We say that the valuation is a *Global Valuation (GV)* if $\mathcal{A}$ is the set of all bounded, self-adjoint operators. In case $\mathcal{A}$ is a context, we say that the valuation is a *Local Valuation (LV)*. We call the mathematical property which allows us to paste consistently together multiple contexts of *LVs* into a single *GV*, *Value Invariance (VI)*. First assume that a *GV* v exists and consider a family of contexts $\{A_i\}_I$. Define the *LV* $v_i := v|_{A_i}$ over each A_i. Then it is easy to verify that the set $\{v_i\}_I$ satisfies the *Compatibility Condition (CC)*,

$$v_i|_{A_i \cap A_j} = v_j|_{A_i \cap A_j}, \quad \forall i, j \in I.$$

The *CC* is a necessary condition that must satisfy a family of *LVs* in order to determine a *GV*. We say that the algebra of self-adjoint operators is *VI* if for every family of contexts $\{A_i\}_I$ and *LVs* $v_i : A_i \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the *CC*, there exists a *GV* v such that $v|_{A_i} = v_i$.

If we have *VI*, and hence, a *GV* exists, this would allow us to give values to all magnitudes at the same time maintaining a *CC* in the sense that whenever two magnitudes share one or more projectors, the values assigned to those projectors are the same in every context. The KS theorem, in algebraic terms, rules out the existence of *GVs* when the dimension of the Hilbert space is greater than 2. The following theorem is an adaptation of the KS theorem —as stated in [18, Theorem 3.2]— to the case of contexts:

THEOREM 4.1 (KS THEOREM) *If $\mathcal{H}$ is a Hilbert space of* $\dim(\mathcal{H}) \rangle 2$*, then a global valuation is not possible.*

KS theorem proves there is no *GV*, and thus, an interpretation of projection operators as *preexistent* properties becomes problematic. The theory cannot be interpreted as representing a *preexistent* actual state of affairs; i.e., a closed situation considered in terms of one or many systems all of which are definable in terms of a set of preexistent or actual (definite valued) properties. In this case preexistence means existence independent of measurement observations, the properties exist independently of being observed or not. There are four main points which are important to stress with respect to our analysis:

i. *KS theorem has nothing to do with measurements.* There is no need of actual measurements for the KS theorem to stand. The theorem is not talking about measurement outcomes, but about the possibility (or not) of considering projection operators as preexistent properties. More specifically, the theorem talks about the constraints implied by the formalism to projection operators (interpreted in terms of properties that pertain to a quantum system). Quantum contextuality cannot be tackled through an analysis in terms of measurements simply because there is no reference at all to any measurement outcome.

ii. *KS theorem is not empirically testable.* As it is well known we cannot measure sets of definite values from a quantum state. In QM we can only measure mean values of observables. The measurement of definite values is restricted to very particular cases.

iii. *KS theorem makes exclusive reference to the quantum formalism.* KS's notion of contextuality makes reference only to the quantum formalism. In this sense it is an internal formal statement of the theory independent on any particular interpretation of QM.

iv. *KS theorem can be read as an ad absurdum proof.* KS makes reference to the interpretation of projection operators in terms of actual (definite valued) properties. Put in a nutshell, KS contextuality deals with the formal conditions that any realist interpretation which respects

orthodox Hilbert space QM must consider in order to consistently provide an objective physical representation of reality.

To sumarize, we can comprise the notion of contextuality implied by KS theorem through the following definition:

DEFINITION 4.1 **Kochen-Specker's Ontic Contextuality:** *Given a vector in Hilbert, the multiple contexts considered in terms of bases or complete set of commuting observables define projection operators which cannot be interpreted as preexistent properties possessing definite values.*

In the following section we will show how the two previous definitions of epistemic and ontic contextuality —which assume contradictory perspectives— have been scrambled together —presumably by Asher Peres— into an omelette which we will attempt to unscramble.

5 Scrambling KS Theorem with Measurement Outcomes

While the epistemic viewpoint discusses about measurement processes and outcomes, the ontic perspective is interested in the way the formalism can be interpreted beyond observable measurement outcomes. In [20], Asher Peres made explicit his instrumentalist perspective arguing, together with Chris Fuchs, that "quantum theory does not talk about physical reality". According to his epistemic account, QM is "an algorithm for computing probabilities for the macroscopic events ('detector clicks')". But this perspective becomes problematic when addressing the KS theorem. As we have argued above, KS's analysis makes no reference at all to measurement outcomes. On the very contrary, KS theorem discusses the possibility of interpreting the formalism in terms of (meta-)physical reality. This is the reason why, for anyone attempting to follow an epistemic path with respect to QM, the KS theorem presents an uncomfortable dilemma.

A radical epistemic proponent might consider a theory to be —following Mach— an "economy of experience", or —following van Fraassen— a formal structure capable of "saving the phenomena". But, the KS theorem makes no reference at all to the epistemic realm of measurements. Instead, it reflects about the ontological interpretation of the formalism in terms of definite valued preexistent properties. KS theorem is exclusively restricted to a formal-metaphysical analysis. This is of course an analysis which does not require *hic et nunc* observations. KS theorem must be understood as a study about the *formal* constraints on projection operators when considered *metaphysically* in terms of actual (definite valued) properties. KS explains why the orthodox formalism provides strong restrictiions to the possibilities of any coherent interpretation of the orthodox quantum formalism.[5] The epistemic viewer might feel quite uncomfortable with the ontic debate presented by Kochen and Specker. How can the epistemic advocate avoid being dragged into such a purely formal-metaphysical discussion? A discussion which —contrary to the epistemic perspective— makes no reference whatsoever to measurement outcomes.

In his excellent book, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*, Peres provides an "epistemic explanation" of the KS theorem which provides the required re-introduction of the notion of measurement within the analysis:

> "The Kochen-Specker theorem asserts that, in a Hilbert space of dimension $d > 2$, it is impossible to associate definite numerical values, 1 or 0, with every projection operator P_m, in

[5] We stress that KS applies only to the orthodox formalism. It does not make reference to different theories like GRW, Bohmian mechanics. Which are not "interpretations of QM" but rather different theories which change the mathematical fomralism.

such a way that, if a set of commuting P_m satisfies $\sum v(P_m) = 1$, the corresponding values, namely $v(P_m) = 0$ or 1, also satisfy. The thrust of this theorem is that any cryptodeterministic theory that would attribute a definite result to each quantum measurement, and still reproduce the statistical properties of quantum theory, is inevitably contextual. *In the present case, if three operators, P_m, P_r, and P_s, have commutators $[P_m, P_r] = [P_m, P_s] = 0$ and $[P_r, P_s] \neq 0$, the result of a measurement of P_m cannot be independent of whether P_m is measured alone, or together with P_r, or together with P_s.*" [*Op. Cit.*, p. 196] (emphasis added)

Today, this explanation has become extremely popular and is found in many papers which discuss the physical meaning of quantum contextuality exposed by KS theorem (e.g. [2, 4, 34, 38]). We can resume this reading in the following definition:

Definition 5.1 Epistemic Reading of KS Theorem: *The measurement outcome of the observable A, when measured together with B or together with C, will necessarily differ in case $[A, B] = [A, C] = 0$, and $[B, C] \neq 0$.*

I myself accepted this "reading" as a "down to earth explanation" of KS theorem in a recent paper [13]. However, when analyzed in detail it is possible to see that, because of the improper mixture of epistemic and ontic presuppositions, the statement has no rigorous physical nor philosophical content. Definition 6.1 describes an experimental situation which, by definition, cannot be empirically tested. It talks about measurements that cannot be measured! This is what is called an *oximoron*. KS theorem is not empirically testable in a direct manner, simply because it never talks about measurements. This is clearly a problem for the epistemic follower. Were we to assume a consistent epistemic perspective, we should try not to make reference to a metaphysical reality beyond measurement outcomes. That would be accepting right from the start an ontic perspective regarding the meaning of a theory in terms of the representation of physical reality independent of observations. Such ontic perspective would force us to abandon our epistemic viewpoint according to which a physical theory must be regarded only as an economy of experience, an algorithm that predicts 'clicks' in detectors.

In order to clearly understand this point, it is of deep importance to distinguish between the *ontic* incompatibility of properties and the *epistemic* incompatibility of measurements. The fact that even in classical physics we can find epistemically incompatible measurement situations has been very clearly discussed by Diederik Aerts in [1]. Aerts discusses the example of a piece of wood which might posses the properties of being "burnable" and "floatable". Both (classical) properties are *testable* through mutually incompatible experimental arrangements. Indeed, in order to test whether the piece of wood can be burned (the "burnability" as it were), we must light it up and see if it burns, but then —because in fact it will burn— it will no longer be possible to test whether the piece of wood floats. In order to measure the "floatability" we must place the piece of wood in a suitable container filled with water and see what happens. The case is, that a burned wood will not float, and also, a wet piece of wood will not burn. Hence, both properties cannot be tested simultaneously. These two experiments are *epistemically incompatible*. However, the properties are not *ontically incompatible*, the epistemic realm of measurements does not make any direct reference to the ontic level of properties. In classical physics, all properties can be thought to exist as actual (ontic) properties due to the fact that the formal Boolean structure of propositions allows an interpretation in terms of an actual state of affairs. The following two definitions are of importance to make clear our analysis:

Definition 5.2 Epistemic Incompatibility of Measurements: *Two contexts are epistemically incompatible if their measurements cannot be performed simultaneously.*

Definition 5.3 Ontic Incompatibility of Properties: *Two contexts are ontically incompatible if their formal elements cannot be considered as simultaneously preexistent.*

As we have argued above, while the Bohrian account of contextuality discusses the epistemic incompatibility of measurement situations, KS contextuality addresses the formal ontic incompatibility of projection operators.

Even though classical mechanics might in principle present an epistemic incompatibility of measurements, due to its commutative (Boolean) structure there is never an ontic incompatibility between classical properties. Due to the structure of the (classical) formalism, classical properties are always ontic compatible between each other. On the contrary, in QM the KS theorem makes explicit the ontic incompatibility between properties. This important result is a consequence of the formalism itself. The epistemic incompatibility in QM appears only when classical contexts are considered. But in such case, since KS does not provide a way to test empirically the statement, the discussion becomes completely metaphysical. The epistemic viewer, when entering the KS debate, seems to have been trapped in a metaphysical net with no reference to observable measurement outcomes.

But there is no escape, KS cannot be empirically tested. It makes reference to definite values of projection operators, not to measurement outcomes. KS does not provide an empirical result, it is a discussion about the limits implied by the formalism of QM to the metaphysical mode of existence of properties (projection operators). KS makes explicit the deep metaphysical problem that any interpretation of QM must face in case it attempts to interpret the theory in terms of an actual state of affairs. This is why, an "epistemic reading" of KS theorem is simply untenable. In conclusion, the KS debate is a purely ontic debate, it has no epistemic elements at play.

6 Preexistent Properties or Statistical Measurements?

Our analysis attempts to provide a proper understanding of the meaning of contextuality in QM, and more specifically, of KS theorem. The widespread epistemic interpretation of KS theorem in terms of measurement outcomes has produced, as a consequence, the improper scrambling of KS theorem with statistical inequalities of the Bell type [**?**]. Today, it is becoming even common to talk, instead of "the KS theorem", of the "Bell-Kochen-Specker Theorem" [2, 12, 28, 31]. We will leave a detailed analysis of this improper scrambling for a future work. To end this paper we will just point out an argument which exposes the difficulties —within the theory of quanta— of shifting the debate from the consideration of the consistency of define values of (preexistent) properties to the reference to statistical outcomes in a repeated series of measurements.

Given a vector in Hilbert space Ψ which represents a quantum system it is possible to ask whether the projection operators that arise from different basis can be considered consistently to possess definite values. As we have discussed above the KS theorem provides a negative answer for dimension higher than 2. The testability of KS theorem would require the simultaneous measurement of mutually incompatible observables; something which, by definition, is simply impossible in the context of QM. As we discussed in section 5, in QM this is not an epistemic impossibility but rather —due to the non-commutativity of the algebra of observables— an ontic impossibility. Thus, to measure *the same* quantum system one requires mutually incompatible measurement setups. This means that, as a consequence, one *necessarily* would be forced to require a series of repeatable measurements. But, is it possible to measure *the same quantum system* repeatedly? The answer is well known for quantum physicists: a simple NO.

One cannot measure the same quantum system repeatedly because of two main well known features of QM:

i. *Measurements in QM are always destructive measurements.* The quantum system is destroyed when measured. If an elementary particle hits a photographic plate we might learn about its energy, its spin, etc., but as a consequence of the imprint the electron will have ceased to exist.

ii. *Quantum systems cannot be cloned.* The well known "no-cloning" theorem [40, 17] of QM shows it is not possible to create a copy of a quantum system. Elementary particles are unique.

Thus, when jumping from the discussion about preexistent properties to the debate about statistical measurable inequalities one cannot provide, within QM, the very basic conditions which assure the tenability of the shift. As it stands, the present debate about KS inequalities is not properly founded. KS theorem cannot be tested empirically and thus, cannot be easily related to statistical inqualities. As Mermin himself has remarked: "the whole notion of an experimental test of KS [theorem] misses the point". We leave a more detailed analysis of the distant relation between KS theorem and Bell inequalities for a future work.

Conclusion

In this paper we have argued that there are two different definitions of quantum contextuality. While the first epistemic notion is due to Bohr's analysis of the measurement process in classical physics, the second ontic definition relates to the intrinsic contextual aspect of the quantum formalism as exposed through the KS theorem. We have shown how these two different understandings of contextuality have been scrambled in the literature through an epistemic misreading of the KS theorem in terms of measurement outcomes. In this respect, we have provided arguments which explain why this widespread understanding of KS contextuality is untenable. Finally we have also provided arguments which criticize the present debate of KS contextuality in terms of measurable statistical inequalities.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the following grants: FWO project G.0405.08. CONICET RES. 4541-12 and Project PIO-CONICET-UNAJ (15520150100008CO) "Quantum Superpositions in Quantum Information Processing".

References

[1] Aerts, D., 1982, "Description of many physical entities without the paradoxes encountered in quantum mechanics", *Foundations of Physics*, **12**, 1131-1170.

[2] Appleby, D. M., 2005, "The Bell-Kochen-Specker theorem", *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, **36**, 1-28.

[3] Bacciagaluppi, G., 2014, "Did Bohr understand EPR?", preprint.

[4] Barrett J. and Kent, A., 2004, "Non-contextuality, finite precision measurement and the Kochen-Specker theorem", *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, **35**, 151.

[5] Bell, J., 2002, "Against Measurement", *Physics World*, **8**, 33-40.

[6] Bell, J., 1966, "On the Problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics", *Review of Modern Physics*, **38**, 477.

[7] Bohr, N., 1935, "Can Quantum Mechanical Description of Physical Reality be Considered Complete?", *Physical Review*, **48**, 696-702.

[8] Bohr, N., 1960, *The Unity of Human Knowledge*, In *Philosophical writings of Neils Bohr*, vol. 3., Ox Bow Press, Woodbridge.

[9] Bokulich, A., 2004, "Open or Closed? Dirac, Heisenberg, and the Relation between Classical and Quantum Mechanics", *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, **35**, 377-396.

[10] Bokulich, P. and Bokulich, A., 2005, "Niels Bohr's Generalization of Classical Mechanics", *Foundations of Physics*, **35**, 347-371.

[11] Cabello, A., Estebaranz, J. and Garcia-Alcaine, G., 1996, "Bell-Kochen-Specker theorem: A proof with 18 vectors", *Physics Letters A*, **212**, 183.

[12] Cabello, A., 1998, "Proposed experimental tests of the Bell-Kochen-Specker theorem", *Physical Review Letters*, **80**, 1797.

[13] de Ronde, C., 2016, "Hilbert Space Quantum Mechanics is Contextual (Reply to Griffiths)", *Cadernos de Historia e Filosofia da Ciencia*, forthcoming. (quant-ph/arXiv:1502.05396)

[14] de Ronde, C., 2016, "Representational Realism, Closed Theories and the Quantum to Classical Limit", in R. E. Kastner, J. Jeknic-Dugic and G. Jaroszkiewicz (Eds.), *Quantum Structural Studies*, World Scientific, Singapore, forthcoming.

[15] de Ronde, C., 2016, "QBism, FAPP and the Quantum Omelette. (Or, Unscrambling Ontological Problems from Epistemological Solutions in QM)", submitted. (quant-ph/arXiv:1608.00548)

[16] Dieks, D., 1988, "The Formalism of Quantum Theory: An Objective Description of Reality", *Annalen der Physik*, **7**, 174-190.

[17] Dieks, D., 1982, "Communication by EPR devices", *Physics Letters A*, **92**, 271-272.

[18] Domenech, G. and Freytes, H., 2005, "Contextual logic for quantum systems", *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, **46**, 012102-1-012102-9.

[19] Einstein, A., Podolsky, B. and Rosen, N., 1935, "Can Quantum-Mechanical Description be Considered Complete?", *Physical Review*, **47**, 777-780.

[20] Fuchs, C.A., and Peres, A., 2000, "Quantum theory needs no 'interpretation' ", *Physics Today*, **53**, 70.

[21] Fuchs, C. A., Mermin, N. D. and Schack, R., 2014, "An introduction to QBism with an application to the locality of quantum mechanics", *American Journal of Physics*, **82**, 749. (quant-ph/arXiv:1311.5253)

[22] Heisenberg, W., 1958, *Physics and Philosophy*, World perspectives, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London.

[23] Heisenberg, W., 1971, *Physics and Beyond*, Harper & Row.

[24] Howard, D., 1994, "Einstein, Kant, and the Origins of Logical Empiricism", In *Logic, Language, and the Structure of Scientific Theories: Proceedings of the Carnap-Reichenbach Centennial, University of Konstanz, 21-24 May 1991*, 45-105, W. Salmon and G. Wolters (Eds.), University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh.

[25] Howard, D., 2004, "Who Invented the 'Copenhagen Interpretation?' A Study in Mythology", *Philosophy of Science*, **71**, 669-682.

[26] Howard, D, 2010, "Einstein's Philosophy of Science", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2010 Edition)*, E. N. Zalta (Ed.), http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2010/entries/einstein-philscience/.

[27] Jaynes, E. T., 1990, *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information*, W. H. Zurek (Ed.), Addison-Wesley.

[28] Kernaghan, M., 1994, "Bell-Kochen-Specker theorem for 20 vectors", *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, **27**, L829.

[29] Kochen, S. and Specker, E., 1967, "On the problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics", *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics*, **17**, 59-87. Reprinted in Hooker, 1975, 293-328.

[30] Kunjwal, R. and Spekkens, R. W., 2015, "From the Kochen-Specker theorem to noncontextuality inequalities without assuming determinism", *Physical Review Letters*, **115**, 110403.

[31] Malley, J. D. and Fine, A., 2014, "A Simplified Basis for Bell-Kochen-Specker Theorems", *Physics Letters A*, **35**, 2611-2613.

[32] Marchildon, L., 2004, "Why Should We Interpret Quantum Mechanics?", *Foundations of Physics*, **34**, pp. 1453-1466.

[33] Mermin, D., 2014, "Why QBism is not the Copenhagen interpretation and what John Bell might have thought of it", preprint. (quant-ph/arXiv:1409.2454)

[34] Meyer, D. A., 1999, "Finite Precision Measurement Nullifies the Kochen-Specker Theorem", *Physical Review Letters*, **83**, 3751.

[35] Pauli, W., 1994, *Writings on Physics and Philosophy*, C. Enz and K. von Meyenn (Eds.), Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

[36] Peres, A., 2002, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

[37] Petersen, A., 1963, "The Philosophy of Niels Bohr", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Sep 1963, 8-14.

[38] Spekkens, R. W., 2005, "Contextuality for preparations, transformations, and unsharp measurements", *Physical Review A*, **71**, 052108.

[39] Wheeler, J. A. and Zurek, W. H. (Eds.) 1983, *Theory and Measurement*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

[40] Wootters, W. and Zurek, W., 1982, "A Single Quantum Cannot be Cloned", *Nature*, **299**, 802-803.